

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Office Action mailed January 30, 2003, has been carefully reviewed in light of the Examiner's helpful comments and suggestions.

The Restriction Requirement mailed September 17, 2002, has been withdrawn. Since the Applicant had cancelled claims 23-25 in the Amendment and Response to the Restriction Requirement filed on November 15, 2002, new claims 27-29 which are identical to original claims 23-25, respectively, have been added.

FIG. 2 has been amended to show the motor and the cooling fan. Since the motor and the cooling fan were previously claimed and described in the specification, no new matter is believed to have been added. Moreover, the specification has been amended accordingly to include reference numerals corresponding to the motor and the cooling fan.

The specification has also been amended to include the description of reference numeral "11b" in FIG. 2, namely the cover 11b. No new matter has been added.

As a result of the Office Action, claims 4-7 and 20-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Claims 4, 5, 20, and 21 have been amended in a manner suggested by the Examiner and it is believed that all those Section 112, second paragraph rejections have been addressed.

Moreover, claim 26 is indicated to be allowable if rewritten

in independent form, and claims 20 and 21 are also indicated to be allowable if amended to overcome those Section 112, second paragraph rejections, and rewritten in independent form.

However, claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Bretthauer. Claims 1-13, 18-19 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Vavrik. Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bretthauer in view of Shinkano or Johnson. And claims 14-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vavrik. These references have been carefully reviewed but are not believed to show or suggest Applicant's invention as now claimed in any manner. Reconsideration and allowance of the pending claims is therefore respectfully requested in view of the following remarks.

Amended claim 1 is now patentably distinguishable from the prior art. A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." *MPEP* 2131. *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987).

Claim 1 now requires that the light be disposed from the saw blade in a lateral direction that is substantially perpendicular a face of the saw blade, and that the light be mounted within the blade case on an inner wall thereof that opposes the saw blade in a lateral direction. Neither Bretthauer nor Vavrik teaches these limitations as required by claim 1.

Bretthauer teaches a light 15A displaced from the saw blade 12 in a facing relation to the cutting edge of the saw blade and not within the blade case and displaced from the saw blade in a lateral direction. Moreover, the light 15A in Bretthauer is not disposed in the blade case but rather is isolated from the saw blade by a tube member 14 inwardly toward the saw blade.

Vavrik teaches a lamp 48 mounted within a frame 1 above the saw blade wherein the light is transmitted through a transmitting rod 49 and not within the blade case and displaced from the saw blade in a lateral direction, as now required by claim 1.

Therefore, for the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that claim 1 is not anticipated by the prior art.

Claims 2-17 are dependent from claim 1 and are therefore allowable for the same reasons as claim 1.

Furthermore, claim 18 is not anticipated by Vavrik. Vavrik does not teach a power supply circuit adapted to supply power to the light, wherein the power supply circuit comprises a first circuit portion disposed within the motor housing and a second circuit portion disposed within the blade case, as required by claim 18. It is respectfully submitted that not only the Examiner is using limitations that are not shown in Vavrik, but also the Examiner is interpreting those limitations contrary to what they are. Applicant respectfully requests from the Examiner to clearly point out where, either in the figures or in the specification, Vavrik shows or teaches "the first circuit (e.g. the wires in the

motor housing) and the second circuit portion (e.g. the terminals of the light bulb)." For the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that claim 18 is not anticipated by the prior art.

Claims 19-22 are dependent from claim 18 and are therefore allowable for the same reasons as claim 18.

Moreover, claim 8 is patentable over Bretthauer in view of Shikano or Johnson. To establish *prima facie* obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. *MPEP* 2143.03. *In re Royka*, 490 F.2d 981, 180 USPQ 580 (CCPA 1974). As stated hereinabove in connection with claim 1, Bretthauer does not teach all the limitations required by claim 8. Neither Shikano nor Johnson address any of the shortcomings of Bretthauer, namely, that the light be disposed from the saw blade in a lateral direction that is substantially perpendicular a face of the saw blade, and that the light be mounted within the blade case on an inner wall thereof that opposes the saw blade in a lateral direction. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that claim 8 is patentable over the prior art combination.

Furthermore, claims 14-17 are patentable over Vavrik. First, Applicant notes that claim 16 is dependent from claim 1 and is therefore allowable for the same reasons as provided in connection with claim 1 hereinabove. Second, the Examiner has based the Section 103(a) rejection by taking official notice that "it is old and well known in the art to use transformers in power supplies for

the purpose providing the specific amount voltage necessary to power the device (e.g. low voltage lights)." In accordance with MPEP 2144.03, Applicant seasonably traverses the Examiner's official notice and respectfully requests the Examiner to produce documentary proof. Third, the combination of Vavrik and Examiner's official notice still does not teach all the limitations required by claim 14, which is dependent from claim 1 and requires that the light be disposed from the saw blade in a lateral direction that is substantially perpendicular a face of the saw blade, and that the light be mounted within the blade case on an inner wall thereof that opposes the saw blade in a lateral direction. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that claim 14 is patentable over prior art.

Claims 15 and 17 are dependent from claim 14 and are therefore allowable for the same reasons as claim 14.

The prior art references made of record by the Examiner have each been considered but are not believed to obviate against the allowability of the claims as amended. It is noted that none of these references have been specifically applied by the Examiner against any of the original claims.

Each issue raised in the Office Action mailed January 30, 2003, has been addressed and it is believed that claims 1-22 and 26-29 are in condition for allowance. Wherefore, Applicant

respectfully requests a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in
this case.

Respectfully submitted,
DENNISON, SCHULTZ &
DOUGHERTY



Amir H. Behnia
Reg. No. 50,215



23338

PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE